

REMARK

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-5 and 9-21 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 9, 15, and 20 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled.

Examiner's Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 10, 2007, in which the Examiner indicated that the Applicant's proposed amendments would overcome the current rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant's claims 1-21 have been rejected under 102(e) as being anticipated over Edlund, U.S. Patent 6,546,388. Applicant does not admit that Edlund is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the reference at a later date. Nonetheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as claimed in claims 1-21 is not described or suggested by Edlund.

Edlund discloses ranking search results based on click popularity and document recency (Edlund, Figure 4, Label 0405). Click popularity ranks a search result based on the number accesses (i.e. clicks) of a piece of information (Edlund, Col. 3, lines 46-48). That is, a search system using click popularity ranks higher a more accessed piece of information than a less accessed piece of information. On the other hand, document recency tracks the age and update frequency of the piece of information (Edlund, Col. 3, lines 48-49). Update frequency ranks only the most recent version of the piece of information (Edlund, Col. 9, lines 31-32). For example “the popularity count is only incremented for the newest version of the website (version 0), which means that the popularity count weighs the new version [of the website] more heavily than any previous version [of the website]” (9/19/06 Office Action, p. 4). As a result, “the weighting is accumulated only for the most recent version” (9/19/06 Office Action, p. 7). Because Edlund increment the newest version and not the older version, Edlund weighs only for the most recent version and gives no weight to the older versions.

However, there is no disclosure in Edlund that weighs a recent click more heavily that an older click based on timestamps of the recent and older clocks For example, claim 1, as amended, requires “creating an enhanced popularity score for a piece of information based on inflation factors applied to clicks of the piece of information, wherein the inflation factors weigh more recent clicks of the piece of information more heavily than older clicks of the piece of information based on timestamps of the recent and older clicks and the inflation factors contribute a positive value to the enhanced popularity score for each of the clicks.”

Claim 3, as amended, states “determining a result of the search consisting of ranking the result based on an enhanced popularity score, wherein the enhanced popularity score for a piece of information weighs more heavily a newer click for the piece of information that an older click for the piece of information based on timestamps of the newer and older clicks and each piece of information contributes a positive value to the enhanced popularity score.”

Furthermore, claim 9, as amended, claim, “modifying the time history of clicks by applying a time decay rate to each click in said time history of clicks, wherein the time decay rate produces a value greater for a newer click of the piece of information that an older click of the piece of information based on timestamps of the newer and older clicks and each value is a positive value.”

Claim 15, as amended, requires, “generating at least two hypothetical enhanced popularity scores based on said click history and said high and low click time decay rates, wherein the time decay rates produce a value greater for a newer click of said piece of information that an older click of said piece of information based on timestamps of the newer and older clicks and each value is a positive value”.

Claim 20, as amended, cites, “reviewing the time and date code at the tracking website to determine whether to account for the website call in an enhanced popularity score, wherein the enhanced popularity score weighs more heavily a newer click of a piece of information that an older click of the piece of information based on timestamps of the newer and older clicks and each piece of information contributes a positive value to the enhanced popularity score”.

The above quoted limitations are not described or suggested by Edlund. Support for the claims, as amended, can be found in paragraphs 13, and 17-34. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are allowable. The Applicant respectfully submits that the dependant claims are allowable for at least the reason that they are dependent on an allowable independent claim.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and remarks, and that the Claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the Claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a telephone interview

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 408-720-8300 if there remains any issue with allowance of this case.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 17, 2007


Eric Replogle
Reg. No. 52,161

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300